



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/941,267	08/29/2001	Cuc Hong	10017259-1	7215

7590 03/22/2004
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

BELL, PAUL A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2675

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/941,267

Applicant(s)

HONG, CUC

Examiner

PAUL A BELL

Art Unit

2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradbury (5,226,540) in view of Bogert (6,062,357).

With regard to claim 1 Bradbury teaches a single unit system (column 1, lines 5-10, to summarize, "portable work station inside case" reads on "a single unit system"), comprising: an enclosure (figure 1), having a power supply port disposed on outside of the enclosure (figure 4, item 9), a computer system configured and arranged in the enclosure (column 2, lines 28-51), a handle to transport the system by pulling the handle, wherein the handle is extendable from the enclosure (figure 3, item 12 and column 2, lines 60-63, note handle pivots and therefore "extendable from the enclosure").

Bradbury does not teach, "and at least one WHEEL to transport the system by pulling the handle, wherein the handle is extendable from the enclosure and RETRACTABLE into the enclosure".

Bogert teaches, "and at least one WHEEL to transport the system by pulling the handle, wherein the handle is extendable from the enclosure and RETRACTABLE into

Art Unit: 2675

the enclosure" (abstract line 4, figure 1, items 21 and 2 and figure 6, column 1, lines 4-18).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bradbury case to have WHEELs and RETRACTABLE handle as taught by Bogert because Bogert provides the motivation for using these features to improve the Bradbury apparatus (SEE Bogert column 1, lines 7-17 "popular", "enable the weight of the bags to be carried on the wheels", and "handle extends to a convenient reach when in use and retracts out of the way when not in use").

With regard to claim 2, Bradbury as modified by Bogert teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the computer system comprises a plurality of personal computer components including a CPU, memory, an input device, and an output device, a printing module, a scanning module, and a video cam (SEE Bradbury column 2, lines 28-51).

With regard to claim 3 most of the limitations were addressed above with regard to claims 1 and 2 by Bradbury as modified by Bogert and further regards to the additional limitations; a compact, self-contained, portable personal computer (PC) system (See Bradbury column 2, lines 27-51), comprising: components disposed in the system enclosure and electrically coupled to the computer components (See Bradbury figure 6), to scan a document placed in the system enclosure (Since it was shown to have a scanner in the enclosure this use is viewed as merely directed towards an "OBVIOUS INTENDED USE" of the work station as the standard function of a scanner

is to scan a document); a printing module, disposed in the system enclosure and electrically coupled to the computer components (See Bradbury figure 6) and the power supply port inside the system enclosure (SEE Bradbury column 6, lines 32-43), to print a document controlled by the computer components (Since it was shown to have a printer in the enclosure this use is viewed as merely directed towards an "OBVIOUS INTENDED USE" of the work station as the normal function of a printer is to print a document); a flat screen display module, disposed on top of the system enclosure and electrically coupled to the computer components and the power supply port inside the system enclosure the flat screen display being rotatably coupled to the system enclosure allowing the flat screen display to be viewable in an open position and to rest on the top of the system enclosure in a closed position (See Bradbury column 2, line 44 "INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE" to now patent 5,212,628 where it's figure 5 items 102, 100 and 74 illustrate these claimed features), to display a personal computer application (Since the combination of Bradbury and Bogert was shown to have a notebook computer which is a personal computer this recitation of use is viewed as merely directed towards the standard use of a display as part of a notebook pc or a work station);

With regard to claim 9, Bradbury as modified by Bogert teaches the system of claim 3, further comprising a case to house the, wherein the case includes a first opening for accessing the first handle(SEE Bogert figure 1 items 1, 2 and 200 also this feature is addressed in regards to claim 1 above).

With regard to claim 10, Bradbury as modified by Bogert teaches the system of claim 9, further comprising a second handle for carrying/lifting the system (SEE Bogert figure 4, items 373 or 374 and one would be motivated to use the second handle when in a hurry in the airport walking up an escalator where it would not be efficient to use the wheels).

With regard to claim 11, Bradbury as modified by Bogert teaches The system of claim 1, further comprising a scanning module, disposed in the enclosure and electrically coupled to the computer system and the power supply port inside the system enclosure, to scan a document placed in the system enclosure (this limitation was rejected in claim 3 above).

With regard to claim 12, Bradbury as modified by Bogert teaches the system of claim 1, further comprising a printing module, disposed in the enclosure and electrically coupled to the computer system and the power supply port inside the system enclosure, to print a document controlled by the computer components (this limitation was rejected in claim 3 above).

With regard to claim 13 Bradbury as modified by Bogert was shown above in claims 1,2,3,9, 10, and 12 to teach all of the limitations for example;
means for enclosing, such as "a system enclosure",
means for scanning a document, such as "a scanning module",
means for printing a document, such as "a printing module",
means for displaying information, such as "a flat screen display module",
means for pulling the means for enclosing, such as "a handle",

means for moving the means for enclosing, such as "a one wheel",

3. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Bradbury(5,226,540) and Bogert (6,062,357) as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Bernard (5,675,524) and Lee (5,870,624).

With regard to claim 4, Bradbury as modified by Bogert does not illustrate; "the system of claim 3, further comprising a tray disposed at bottom of the system enclosure and an input device stored inside the tray when the input device is not in use, wherein the tray includes a docking station port for communicating with a second computer system".

Lee teaches, "a tray disposed at bottom of the system enclosure and an input device stored inside the tray when the input device is not in use" (SEE Lee figure 2, items 16, 35, and 36).

Bernard teaches, "a docking station port for communicating with a second computer system" (SEE Bernard abstract, figure 2 and figure 4, item 102).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Bradbury and Bogert case to have "a tray disposed at the bottom of case and an input device stored inside tray when input device is not in use" as taught by Lee because Lee provides the motivation for using these features to improve the combination of Bradbury and Bogert (SEE Lee figure 2, where it is self evident that this feature saves space, provides a place to store input device when not in use and provides a support when the input device is being used).

And in addition it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Bradbury, Bogert and LEE

to have "a docking station port for communicating with a second computer system" incorporated into a tray as taught by Bernard because Bernard provides the motivation for using these features to improve the Bradbury, Bogert and Lee apparatus (SEE Bernard column 1, lines 35-60, "The communications device provides multiple alternative communication capabilities for the portable computer" which would of made the apparatus more marketable) .

4. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Bradbury (5,226,540), Bogert (6,062,357), Lee (5,870,624) and Bernard (5,675,524) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Inagaki et al. (6,504,529).

With regard to claims 5 and 6 the combination of Bradbury, Bogert, Lee, and Bernard suggest, "keyboard or mouse operatively associated with the computer components in such a manner that an input from the keyboard is stored in the memory and displayable on the flat screen display" (Since the combination was shown to have a keyboard or mouse this recitation of use is viewed as merely directed towards the standard and conventional use of the keyboard in the work station).

With further regard to claims 5 and 6 the combination of Bradbury, Bogert, Lee, and Bernard does not illustrate the system of claim 4, "wherein the input device is an infrared keyboard or mouse".

Inagaki et al. teaches "wherein the input device is an infrared keyboard or mouse" (SEE Inagaki et al. figure 25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Bradbury, Bogert, Lee, and Bernard apparatus to have infrared keyboard or mouse as taught by Inagaki et al. because

being wireless gives the user more options as to set up in relation to the display and being able to remotely hold the keyboard frees up desk space for writing notes or putting paper documents in easy view.

5. Claims 7, 14, 15, 16, and 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over combination of Bradbury (5,226,540) and Bogert (6,062,357) as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Kikinis (5,870,624).

With regard to claim 7, Bradbury as modified by Bogert does not illustrate; "the system of claim 3, wherein the system enclosure includes a document FEED-IN SLOT and a document EXIT SLOT disposed ON OPPOSITE SIDES of the system enclosure, respectively, such that the scanning module scans the document fed into the document feed-in slot and outputs the document at the document exit slot" though they do show using a scanner and printer and these devices generally have input and output slots for documents.

Kikinis teaches a document feed-in slot and a document exit slot disposed on opposite sides of the system enclosure, respectively, such that the scanning module scans the document fed into the document feed-in slot and outputs the document at the document exit slot" (SEE Kikinis figure 1a, item 15, 17 and 23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination Bradbury and Bogert to have a document feed-in slot and a exit slot disposed on opposite sides of the enclosure as taught by Kikinis because Kikinis provides the motivation for using these features to improve the of combination of Bradbury and Bogert apparatus (SEE Kikinis last three line of abstract, "The device provides a SMALL, relatively INEXPENSIVE, and compact

Art Unit: 2675

package which may be placed at a user's computer workstation" and column 1, lines 42-50, "What is CLEARLY NEEDED is a low-cost device that COMBINES PRINTING AND SCANNING FUNCTIONS and is yet small enough to be placed conveniently on a user's desk, or MOUNTED IN the base of a video monitor or in THE CASE of a computer. Also since Bradbury clearly shows scanning and printing it is just a simple matter of modifying these elements for the motivational reasons given in Kikinis.

With regard to claims 14 and 15 the limitations were rejected above.

With regard to claims 16 and 17 the combination of Bradbury, Bogert and Kikinis teaches the system of claim 13, further comprising a printing input port means for feeding documents to the means for printing and further comprising a printing output port means for ejecting documents from the means for printing (See Kikinis figure 1a).

6. Claims 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over combination of Bradbury (5,226,540) and Bogert (6,062,357) as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Ma (5,880,928).

With regard to claim 8, Bradbury as modified by Bogert does not illustrate; "The system of claim 3, further comprising a video cam, DISPOSED ON the flat screen display, to record a view around the system ", though it does show using a video camera.

Ma teaches "a video cam, disposed on the flat screen display, to record a view around the system " (SEE Ma figure 2, item 222).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Bradbury and Bogert to have a video cam on the display as taught Ma because Ma provides the motivation for using

these features to improve the combination of Bradbury and Bogert apparatus (SEE Ma column 1, lines 11-25, and the exact placement of the camera in the combination of Bradbury and Bogert would be simply where it would record what is desired. Usually a camera would be positioned as in Ma for purposes like video conferencing).

With regard to claim 18 the limitation of the system of claim 13, further comprising means for capturing images of an environment outside of the means for enclosing for example such as "a video cam" in claims 1, 2, 3, 8, and 13.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 12/15/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With regard to claim 1 on pages 6-8 applicant argues that the motivation given by examiner is improper, because the wheels of Bogert would prove useless on the rugged air and water tight case of Bradbury, when used in an hostile outdoor environment.

The examiner disagrees. The fact that the combination of Bradbury and Bogert apparatus can be used in a hostile environment does in no way limit it's use to that environment, and further the user would desire any means such as wheels to facilitate transport from the home base to the hostile environment and arguments put forth as to narrow situations when wheels would not be useful are irrelevant as long as there are situations where the wheels can be useful is all the motivation that is needed and therefore the motivation given is considered proper motivation.

With further regard to claim 1 on page 8 applicant argues that "a retractable handle would be ill suited in an air and water tight case because it would be difficult, if not impossible, to seal a case having a retractable handle".

The examiner disagrees. The examiner maintains one of ordinary skill would maintain the main objective of the primary reference Bradbury when making the modifications of adding a retractable handle. This modification would be done by simply having a separate inner chamber that jets into from the side into the main chamber and one would also be motivated to do it this way to simply avoid the possibility of the handle running into sensitive equipment inside. When working with molded plastics and metals these manufacturing methods are simplistic and well known.

With regard to claim 3 on page 9 applicant argues that the Bradbury incorporated reference (5,212,628) does not teach or suggest, "a scanning module, disposed in the system enclosure and electrically coupled to the computer components and the power supply port inside the system enclosure, to scan a document placed in the system enclosure". The applicant then goes on to cite a section column 3, lines 34-38 from this incorporated reference.

"By way of example, the peripheral devices to be carried within the body 4 of case 1 include a digital camera 30, a cellular telephone having an associated hand set 32 and an optical scanner 34."

The examiner now cites the next lines in this incorporated reference;

"However, the work station **is not limited to peripheral devices** 30, 32 and 34, such, that these **and/or other** conventional peripheral **may be carried** in case 1 and **interface with computer** 100". Note the word "interface" reads on broad word "integrated .

The examiner would also like to site from the relevant primary reference used Bradbury (5,226,540) ;

"However, the work station disclosed in my **earlier application** is but one example of a preferred work station that can be carried within case 1. Nerveless, it is to be understood that **the precise configuration** of the work station selected for transport in carrying case 1 **is not to be regarded as a limitation of the present invention.**"

That is why Bradbury chose to illustrate a simple block diagram for his system in figure 6 so all configurations would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Therefore examiner disagrees and maintains "obvious intended use" statements used in rejection above.

With further regard to claim 3 the applicant on page 9 argues that Bradbury does not teach or suggest, "a flat screen display module, disposed on top of the system enclosure."

The examiner disagrees because figure 5 in the incorporated reference illustrates one of many possible configurations and I see part of that case under the computer display so therefore it reads on this very broad language.

With regard to claim 4 applicant on page 10 argues that the motivation to combine the tray of Lee and the docking port of Bernard with the combination of

Bradbury and Bogert is improper because; "a tray of Lee would alter the Bradbury case and render it useless for its intended function the case would not be air or water tight."

The examiner disagrees. The same relevant arguments above with regard to claim 1 handle are applicable here and irregardless the broad language, "a tray disposed at the bottom of the system enclosure" does not require , "into enclosure" as claim 1 did but can be attached at bottom and read on this.

With regard to claims 5 and 6 the applicant on page 11 argues that the combination of such a large number of references clearly shows the improper use of hindsight.

The examiner disagrees. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner has combined an excessive number of references, reliance on a large number of references in a rejection does not, without more, weigh against the obviousness of the claimed invention. See *In re Gorman*, 933 F.2d 982, 18 USPQ2d 1885 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

With regard to claim 7 the applicant argues on page 11-12 that adding the feed ports of Kikinis would clearly alter the Bradbury case and render it useless for its intended function because the case would not be air or water tight.

The examiner disagrees. The examiner maintains one of ordinary skill would maintain the main objective of the primary reference Bradbury when making the modifications of adding the Kikinis feed ports. This modification would be done by simply having a separate closeable door at each feed port and only opening when needed.

With regard to claim 8 the applicant argues on page 12 there is no suggestion for mounting the portable camera to the flat screen display.

The examiner disagrees and references the rejection above for the motivation.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2675

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Bell whose telephone number is (703) 306-3019.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377 can help with any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or Faxed to: (703) 872-9306

Or Hand-delivered to: Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor
(Receptionist).

Paul Bell

Paul Bell

Art unit 2675

March 9, 2004

Chanh Nguyen
CHANH NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER